

III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Sayers.

Sayers discloses a communication system formed by a private network including a private wireless network, a public wireless network using a public wireless protocol, such as GSM, and public networks, such as PSTN, ISDN and the Internet, using a wired protocol, such as IP. The private network also includes a local area network (LAN), which is connected to the public networks using IP protocol. The public and private wireless networks operate with the GSM protocol, and the private wireless network additionally operates with the IP protocol. Standard mobile stations are used in both public and private wireless networks using standard mobile stations such that active speech calls can be handed over from public to private wireless network or to the opposite direction.

Sayers mentions that GSM services include, besides voice calls, also data, telefax and short message services (SMS), for example. However, Sayers discusses only handling of voice calls, which procedure does not suit, as such, other services provided by the GSM system. This is particularly true for GSM circuit-switched data calls, wherein the technical approach is totally different than in voice calls.

In the wording of claim 1, Sayers lacks at least the following features (missing features underlined):

A telecommunications system, which comprises an office network and an operator network and a local area network between them, wherein the office network comprises

at least one mobile system terminal,

a base transceiver station,

a radio access gateway controlling the base transceiver station and adapted to have a functional connection with the local area network and configured to adapt the data transmission protocols of said mobile system and local area network to each other,

a call control entity, which is configured to control said radio access gateway through a signalling connection and arranged to detect the establishment of an internal data connection in the office network, which data connection uses a data protocol according to said mobile system;

an interworking function to which a signalling connection from said call control entity is arranged and which interworking function is configured to adapt data connections according to the data protocol of at least said mobile system and coming from the radio access gateway to the data protocol according to said office network, in response to the call control entity detecting the establishment of an internal data connection in the office network, at least the second party of the data connection being said mobile system terminal, and

the operator network is configured to adapt data transmission between the office network and a public land mobile network together.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has picked up unconnected features from the disclosure of Sayers and combined them in a way, which is confusing and not technically viable. For example, in the arguments regarding claim 1, the passage referred

by the Examiner (col. 3, lines 42 - 48) does not disclose a radio access gateway or a call control entity according to the invention, but a plain base station controller (BSC) of a GSM system. In Figure 2, the element 23 referred by the Examiner is a hub, not a radio access gateway. A prior known BSC is not configured to adapt the data transmission protocols of said mobile system and local area network to each other, and nor is a hub.

Furthermore, the Examiner refers to the same passage (col. 3, lines 42 - 48, i.e., a prior known BSC) as being the call control entity, which is arranged to detect the establishment of an internal data connection in the office network, which data connection uses a data protocol according to said mobile system. It is evident that a prior known BSC cannot be used for the purpose required by the office system of the present invention. A prior known BSC is not used for detecting the establishment of an internal data connection in the office network.

Moreover, the passage referred by the Examiner (col. 18, lines 56 - 60) as being an interworking function configured to adapt data transmission between the office network and a public land mobile network together is incorrect. The passage only mentions that the gateway translates the IMSI (i.e. subscriber identity) into a form readable by a public home location register (HLR); it does not relate to data transmission by any means.

Even though Sayers mentions GSM circuit-switched data services (col. 6, lines 18 - 22) as background of the invention, their specific nature is not recognized in any example, which all relate to voice calls. In the GSM circuit-switched data services, the data transmission chain comprises several network elements,

which perform several data transmission rate adaptations to the transmitted data. In the GSM system, data is inserted in RLP frames and then transmitted between a terminal adaptation function TAF in a mobile station and the interworking function IWF of the MSC. The interworking function IWF disassembles data placed in TRAU frames in the GSM system and converts the data transmission rate and the frame structure to suit another telecommunications system, if required.

Accordingly, the operation of the invention requires, in addition to various network elements, which perform data transmission rate adaptations, also detecting the establishment of an internal GSM data connection in the office network. Sayers is silent of detecting any GSM data connection, which proves that Sayers does not even recognize the problem underlying the present invention. Consequently, Sayers discloses no implementation for providing internal GSM data calls in the office system.

Claim 10 has method limitations corresponding to the apparatus limitations of claim 1.

To constitute anticipation a single reference must disclose every element of the claim, see Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 218 USPQ 781,789. Here there are numerous elements of claims 1 and 10 missing from Sayers. Thus the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 under 35 USC 102 on Sayers should be withdrawn. Further, since there is no suggestion of the missing limitations in Sayers, these claims are unobvious over it.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers.

It is noted that the prior art itself must suggest a modification; the mere fact that the prior art could be modified is insufficient, see Ex parte Granneman, 68 USPQ2d 1219, 1221. Here there is absolutely no such suggestion. Thus the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC 103 on Sayers should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers in view of Gossman.

It is noted that Gossman is not for the problem of avoiding the public network as is the present invention. Thus it cannot be combined with Sayers, see In re Laskowski 10 USPQ2d 1397, 1398-99. Here there is no such common problem. Thus the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$1020.00 is enclosed for a 3 month extension of time fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler
Henry I. Steckler
Reg. No. 24,139

March 21, 2005
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No. 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 3/21/05

Signature: Dou W. Peiman
Person Making Deposit